

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-11 and 21-32 are in this application and are presented for consideration. Claims 5, 9, 10 and 21 have been amended, and new claims 29 - 32 have been added.

The specification and claims have been amended to address the Examiner's objections and to place the application in better form.

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, and thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter.

Previous independent claim 2 has been rejected as being anticipated by Yoshida. With this amendment applicant has canceled claim 2 and added new independent claim 29.

Claim 29 sets forth a bicycle frame including a steering sleeve and a brake mounted on the bicycle frame. The steering sleeve is described in the specification in the last two paragraphs on page 3, and the brake is described several times in the specification as a brake or brake caliber, in particular in the first and last paragraphs on page 4. The steering sleeve is also commonly known in the field of bicycles as being formed by the front vertical tube of the frame. Claim 29 also sets forth a steering stem rotatably mounted in the steering sleeve. This steering stem is also described in the specification on page 3 last paragraph. If the Examiner desires, the bicycle frame with the steering sleeve can be added to the drawings.

The rejection equates the steering stem of the original claims with element 2 of

Yoshida. Applicant has reviewed element 2 of Yoshida, and notes that element 2 is described as the top of a front fork 1. A front fork of a motorcycle is a different structure than a steering stem of a bicycle. A front fork of a motorcycle is not rotatably mounted in a steering sleeve of a frame. In Yoshida, and as is well known in motorcycles, there are two forks which connect to the front wheel at their lower end. The upper end of these two forks are rotated about a head pipe of the motorcycle frame as described in Yoshida in column 3 lines 31 and 32. Therefore the fork 1 and its top 2 of Yoshida are not the same as the steering stem of the present claims, since the fork of Yoshida is not rotatably mounted in a steering sleeve. New claim 29 therefore defines over the rejection.

Claim 21 has been amended to depend from claim 29 and sets forth that the lug is directly connected to the steering stem. The rejection equates the lug of the claims with element 3 of Yoshida. However element 3 of Yoshida is not directly connected to a steering stem. Instead element 3 of Yoshida appears to be directly connected to element 2 which is the top of a fork 1. Therefore element 3 of Yoshida does not have all the features of the lug of claim 21. Claim 21 therefore further defines over Yoshida.

Previous claim 2 has also been rejected as being obvious over Andrus in view of Yoshida. The rejection states that Andrus lacks a specific showing of a pump assembly held inside a lug connecting a handlebar to a steering stem of a bicycle. It appears that Yoshida is then used to describe this feature. However as described above, element 2 in Yoshida is not a steering stem, and therefore element 3 of Yoshida is not the same as the lug of new claim 29. Claim 29 therefore also defines over the combination of Andrus and Yoshida.

New claim 30 sets forth a brake lever device mounted on the handlebar and spaced from the lug. The brake lever device is also set forth as being operatively connected to the pump. One embodiment of this is shown in figure 1 where the brake lever device is represented by reference 44, and is operatively connected by elements 4 and 5 to the pump. As one can see, element 44 is spaced from element 3 in present figure 1.

In comparison, it appears that in Yoshida, any brake lever device is integral with element 3 which has been equated with the lug of the present invention. Yoshida in particular indicates in column 2 lines 40 to 45 that the brake lever 31 has a base portion 32 which is connected to the bracket 30. This bracket 30 is indicated as being an integral part of the body 10. Yoshida further indicates that the body 10 is integrally formed with the bracket 3 in column 2, lines 6 and 7. Therefore any brake lever device in Yoshida is not spaced from a lug, but instead appears to be integrally connected with the structure that the rejection equates with the lug of the present invention. Since Yoshida does not describe a brake lever device spaced from a lug, claim 30 further defines over the applied prior art.

New claim 31 sets forth a cable connecting the brake lever device to the pump, where the cable transfers motion of the brake lever device to the pump. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion of a cable in the prior art transferring motion from a brake lever device to a pump. Therefore claim 31 further defines over the applied prior art.

New claim 32 sets forth that the cable includes a sheath and that the sheath is connected to a piston of the pump. This is described in the specification on page 4, last paragraph. Applicant finds no teaching nor suggestion in the applied prior art of a cable with the sheath

connected to a piston of a pump, and therefore claim 32 further defines over the applied prior art.

Claims 5, 9 and 10 have been amended to depend from claim 30 and set forth further features regarding the connection between the brake lever device and the pump. Since Yoshida does not have any brake lever device spaced from a lug, Yoshida further cannot describe this connection as set forth in these claims. These claims therefore further define over the applied prior art.

Applicant again thanks the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which would further favorable prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative by telephone to discuss possible changes.

At this time applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application, and based on the above amendments and remarks, respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,



By: _____
Theobald Dengler
Registration No. 34,575
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.

TD:pl
71277RCE.21

DATED: September 22, 2006
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
(914) 941-5600

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-
0410.